INDIANA
LIBRARY
MAR 27 1931

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by Loyola University Press, 3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. Rev. James A. Kleist, S. J., Editor. Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.

Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. VII APRIL, 1931 No. 7

Reading Latin Without Grammar

In 1922 C. H. Judd and G. T. Buswell made a study of various types of silent reading by photographing the eye-movements of students as they read. Among the subjects of the experiment were the two best third-year Latin students from each of seven high schools in and near Chicago. The material they were asked to read consisted of fairly simple passages from Eutropius and Caesar. The findings, it must be confessed, were not very complimentary to the method of Latin instruction by which these students had been trained. Though the authors of the investigation speak rather strongly in their report, an examination of the record will convince anyone, it is likely, that their strictures were justified.

> The significance of these records is not difficult to discover. Latin students are not taught to read. They are trained only to look at words. Not only so, but they are so trained to look at words that it is quite impossible to find any system in their looking. There seem to be no mental devices in their experience for disentangling a complex of Latin words. Of course, the chief instrument used for this purpose in ordinary school work is entirely withdrawn in these experiments. . . . The result is that when the vocabulary is withdrawn the world looks like a great confusion.[1]

That was in 1922. Two or three years later a new method of teaching students to read Latin was inaugurated in the Chicago University High School, and in 1927 there came an opportunity to measure its results by photographing the eye-movements of some of the students trained by the new method; the selections read were the same as those used in the 1922 study. In this second investigation, however, instead of fourteen third-year Latin pupils, twenty-four subjects from the University High School were examined, eight from each of the middle halves of the first-, second-, and third-year Latin classes.

A comparison of the results of the two investigations is overwhelmingly in favor of the second group, taught to read Latin by what we may call, for lack of a better name, the Grammarless Method. Even the first-year students of Latin thus trained showed unmistakably that they were developing more mature reading habits than the best third-year pupils trained by the usual Grammar-Translation method. To give but the barest summary of the findings: The first-year group of University High pupils in 1927 made an average of 13 fixations per line, 2.3 regressive movements per line, and an average duration pause of 9 twenty-fifths of a second, whereas of the 1922 group of third-year pupils one of the very best made 23 fixations per line, 8.5 regressive movements per line, and pauses averaging 7.3 twenty-fifths of a second, while one of the poorest made 50.8 fixations per line, 23 regressive movements per line, and pauses averaging 7.2 twenty-fifths of a second.[2] For a fuller understanding of these data one should consult the monographs of Buswell and Judd,[3] but for purposes of comparison it may be said that the eye-movements of a representative group of second-year high school students in reading a simple passage of English prose were as follows: Fixations per line 5.6, regressive movements per line 0.4, duration of fixation pauses 6.8 twenty-fifths of a second per line.

In view of the notorious fact, however, that laboratory schools like the Chicago University High School are specially favored in many ways, it seems worth while to refer the reader to an article by A. G. Bovée,[4] in which he compares the success in translating Latin of three groups of students: one trained in the University High School by what we have called the Grammarless Method; the second trained by the same method in an outside school; the third trained by the usual Grammar-Translation method in an outside school. Whereas the first group is out in front from the start and is constantly increasing its high rate of improvement, the fact is noteworthy that the second group outstrips the Grammar-Translation group in the third year and shows thereafter a strong rise in ability to read, whereas in the Grammar-Translation group there is but a small difference between first- and third-year pupils in ability to translate and small promise of future development.

These facts and a study of the literature on the subject would seem to justify a Latin teacher's interest in this Grammarless Method of teaching Latin. Accordingly, when an opportunity to visit some classes thus taught offered itself early last fall, I availed myself of the chance to observe the method in operation. I visited first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year Latin classes, but believe a report on the procedure followed in first-year will be of most interest to the reader. After describing the *modus operandi* I will try to outline some of the features of the system and state some of the principles upon which it is based.

"*Salvete, discipuli,*" was teacher's greeting as she strode into the classroom. "*Salve, magistra,*" the response of twenty first-year high school pupils eager for their fifth class in Latin. Without wasting any time *Magistra* was furnishing fuel to feed that eagerness.

"Take a sheet of paper and write for me in Latin six or seven facts about some one you know or like. You

will be allowed five minutes in which to do this." To all appearances most of these young people were through with their task before the time was up.

"Skip two lines now and write in Latin who you are. . . . Next tell me something that you like. . . . Then tell me some one your mother likes. . . . Finally ask me a question about my mother."

Within ten minutes of the opening *"Salvete"* these *discipuli* had written ten or eleven Latin sentences of their own composition, which *Magistra* invited me to examine at the end of the class, warning me that there would be many mistakes; after all this was but the fifth day of Latin for the class. After glancing through several of the papers I decided that *Magistra* was guilty of what Rodriguez calls fish-hook humility, for the mistakes were very few.

In the meantime, while the class was thus occupied, *Magistra* wrote this reading lesson on the board:

Haec terra est America. Americam amo. America est patria mea. Patriam meam amo. Amasne patriam tuam? America est terra longa et pulchra. Fama Americae est magna. Fortuna Americae est bona. America non est patria pueri. Italia est patria pueri. Puer Italiam, patriam, amat. Italia est patria antiqua.

After *Magistra* had read the whole aloud, slowly and intelligently, and the class in unison had repeated the reading for practice in pronunciation, there followed comprehension questions. "In this section what facts are mentioned about America? Hands!" Twenty hands shot up, and the facts about America were soon recounted. "What persons are mentioned? Hands!" All hands were up to tell us that I and you and the boy made up the cast of characters. Finally each sentence in order was translated. In the higher classes there was less translating and more comprehension questions. Since the clock showed that ten minutes remained before the end of the period, *Magistra* wrote on the board another selection, about Cuba, which was run through as rapidly as the one about America with oral reading, questions, translations.

Had you asked one of these twenty pupils to decline the *patria* or *mater* that they all love, or to conjugate the present indicative of *amo,* you would have got little reward for your pains, for they would probably not have understood your English words *decline* and *conjugate*. You might ask them in what case the direct object of a transitive verb should be put, and succeed no better. Yet they could tell you as quick as a flash that *"Amo matrem meam,"* means "I love my mother." The words *genitive, dative, accusative, ablative, transitive, intransitive,* and all the rest of grammar's technical terminology would be still beyond the range of their vocabulary. "Appositives agree in case," for instance, would mean nothing to them, but they understood *Magistra* when she wrote *"Puer Italiam, patriam, amat."*

At any rate, there you have an illustration from actual life of an attempt to teach pupils to read Latin in a way that is different. To quote Morrison: "The method can be summarized as learning to read thought content by abundant experience in reading thought content from the beginning." The study of grammar is taboo until the pupils have learned to read Latin, as the study of English grammar is taboo in the elementary school until the children can read English.

This absence of grammar study is the feature that distinguishes the method best from either the Direct Method or the Grammar-Translation Method, both of which give much attention to rules of grammar, the difference being that one uses Latin as the medium of instruction, the other English. The Grammar-Translation Method, in conformity with which most of our Latin textbooks are written, leans heavily on the study as an aid to reading, but so does the Direct Method as followed, for instance, in the Perse School, Cambridge. Although the Grammarless Method is more akin to the Direct than to the Grammar-Translation Method, it is scarcely to be identified with it. Thus, though it makes more use of oral Latin, especially at the outset, than does the Analytic Method, it does not, like the Direct Method, attempt to make Latin the almost exclusive language of the classroom. Finally, whereas it lays stress on growth of vocabulary by induction instead of by the study of word-lists, it aims to lead the pupil to recognize the meaning of new words rather from sentence context than by means of pantomine, pictures, models, and the like, and tries to establish them in the pupil's memory by frequent recurrence in connected discourse.

Thus, if the object were to introduce the pupils to the meaning of the word *flumen,* the method would not have him learn that *flumen, -inis,* n., means *river;* nor would it show him a picture of a river and pointing to it say *"Hoc est flumen."* But it would introduce the word in a context where the meaning of *flumen* would be unmistakably clear. For instance, *"Flumen maximum totius Americae est Mississippi flumen."* Possibly it might be called an Inductive Method, but it should be remarked that the purpose is not to have the pupils consciously formulate general laws from the particular examples seen, and thus build their own formal grammar, but to bring them to recognize immediately the value and significance of forms, constructions, and words (as it were instinctively) when they appear in connected discourse. The Grammarless Method of teaching to read Latin refuses to turn a reading lesson into grammar study.

Milford, Ohio JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.

(To be continued)

NOTES

1. G. T. Buswell, *A Laboratory Study of the Reading of Modern Foreign Languages.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1927, p. 75.
2. *Ibid.,* p. 72 sqq.
3. C. H. Judd and G. T. Buswell, *Silent Reading: A Study of the Various Types.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.
4. Arthur Gibson Bovée, "Some Fallacies of Formalism," *The Modern Language Journal,* VIII, 131-144.

There is a certain education which our sons should receive not as being practically useful, nor as indispensable, but as liberal and noble.—*Aristotle*

A Note on Roman Satire

The general reader thinks of Roman satire as a device for the earnest or playful castigation of moral blemishes and weaknesses of character. Such a castigation Roman satire certainly was; yet from its beginning it also concerned itself with the aesthetically wrong and with literary and linguistic criticism.

Lucilius, for instance, deprecates the over-delicacy of word-combination in Albucius, who arranges his vocables with the nicety of a worker in mosaic:

> Quam lepide λέξεις compostae ut tesserulae omnes
> arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato.
>
> *Frag.* 84 f. Marx.

Again, he criticized Accius and the great Ennius, as we learn from Horace (*Serm.* 1, 10, 53 f):

> Nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci,
> non ridet versus Enni gravitate minores?

Porphyrio, in his note on the first of these lines, remarks: *Facit autem Lucilius hoc cum alias, tum vel maxime in tertio libro.* In a well-known passage in his ninth book,[1] Lucilius distinguishes, for purposes of technical use, between the two words *poema* and *poesis*. In the same book, discussing orthography, he rejects the proposal of Accius to express, by doubling a vowel, its length by nature, and reserve the single character for the short vowel:

> AA primum longa, A brevis syllaba, nos tamen unum
> hoc faciemus et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto
> scribemus *pacem, placide, Ianum, aridum, acetum,*
> ῞Αρες, ῎Αρες, Graeci ut faciunt.
>
> *Frag.* 352 ff. Marx.

Horace deals with literary criticism *ex professo* in the fourth and tenth satires of his first book and in the first satire of the second. Here he goes far towards establishing *satura* once for all as a means of literary criticism. It has been suggested that at the time of writing, he was in the midst of an acrimonious literary controversy.[2] The same literary and aesthetic interest forms one of the important links between the Horatian satire and the Horatian epistle.[3]

In Persius, the only one of the six pieces in the *liber saturae* that is really satirical in spirit, and not a mere discourse on Stoic philosophy, is the first, and in it the poet deals with abuses in contemporary letters, such as the worship of artificially smooth and dainty verses, shorn of all strength and natural ruggedness. So universal, he insists, is this craving for elegance in utterance, that a defendant prefers praise of his polished diction to acquittal:

> Nilne pudet capiti non posse pericula cano
> pellere, quin tepidum hoc optes audire, 'Decenter'?
> 'Fur es,' ait Pedio. Pedius quid? Crimina rasis
> librat in antithetis, doctas posuisse figuras
> laudatur: 'Bellum hoc.'
>
> *Sat.* 1, 83 ff.

Juvenal, who makes his first satire an apology for his choice of *satura*, lashes the writers of well-worn and enfeebled epic themes. Others of his satires show at least incidental traces of literary criticism, as the famous passage that has done so much to minimize Cicero's claim to poetic laurels:

> 'O fortunatam natam me consule Romam!'
> Antoni gladios potuit contemnere, si sic
> omnia dixisset.
>
> *Sat.* 10, 122 ff.

In view of all this evidence it is not a little surprising to find that some ancient authorities seem to disregard altogether this literary purpose of the old Roman satire. Diomedes, for instance, who flourished in the fourth century, says that Lucilian satire was written (*GLK* 1, 485) *ad carpenda hominum vitia.* The term *hominum* in that context is not vague enough to include literary men as such, nor the term *vitia* elastic enough to include literary blemishes. The truth is that Lucilius, who fashioned satire as a literary genre[4] out of the formless and miscellaneous *satura*, found one important use for it in the field of literary criticism. This use he bequeathed to his successors. Since his time, Roman satire is not only a vehicle of attack in general, but also the traditional means of literary and aesthetic criticism in particular. His authority and influence were potent enough to forge the innocent *satura* into satire, and make it a sharp-edged weapon for the literary critic of succeeding ages.

St. Louis, Mo. WILLIAM C. KORFMACHER

NOTES

1. *Frag.*, 339-347. Marx.
2. Cf. Hendrickson, *Horace and Valerius Cato,* (*Cl. Ph.* 11, 249; 12, 77. 329).
3. For example, *Ep.* 1, 19, and the three Epp. of the second book.
4. Horace, *Serm.*, 1, 10, 48, speaking of his reasons for writing satire, admits he is *inventore* (*Lucilio*) *minor.*

Professor Mackail's annotated edition of the Aeneid has at last seen the light of day. (*The Aeneid of Virgil,* by J. W. Mackail—Oxford University Press, 1930.) It does not aim to displace Sidgwick's or Knapp's excellent school editions, but furnishes, in its introduction and commentary, the kind of valuable material for artistic interpretation which the teacher of humane letters appreciates highly. Some teachers of Vergil may find unlocked to them here the secret of beauties of conception, structure, diction, rhythm, which they perhaps never even suspected to exist in the Aeneid. Professor Mackail is an artist and handles the greatest Roman poet as only an artist of kindred feeling and inspiration can do.

The Greeks were the first to discover that beauty is the most determinate thing in the world; that one may seek it in vain, after the fashion of Oriental art, in the enormous, the indefinite, and the monstrous (with which our aesthetic depravity tends again to confound it); it is made of order, measure, adjustment.—*Boutmy*

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS
3441 North Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
Subscription price: One Dollar a Year.
Entered as second class matter December 14, 1927, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITOR
James A. Kleist, S. J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Francis A. Preuss, S. J...St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo.
Joseph A. Walsh, S. J.....Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio
Julian L. Maline, S. J.....Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio

BUSINESS EDITOR
Aloysius A. Jacobsmeyer, S. J.....3441 North Ashland Avenue
Chicago, Illinois
and Florissant, Mo.

All business communications (subscriptions, etc.), should be sent to the Business Editor, 3441 No. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill., or Florissant, Mo.

OFFICERS OF THE MISSOURI PROVINCE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
President.....Francis G. Deglman, S. J.
Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska
Secretary.....William R. Hennes, S. J.
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. VII APRIL, 1931 No. 7

Editorial

That the star of the Higher Criticism has had its day, and that a more reverent and reasonable attitude towards tradition and the written records of the past is gradually superseding it, is convincingly set forth by our premier Homeric scholar, Professor John A. Scott, in an eloquent address entitled *Luke, Greek Physician and Historian* (Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University, 1930). On the basis of the unprecedented reversal of opinions that has taken place in Homeric scholarship during the last twenty years—a series of events of which he himself might well say with justifiable pride, *quorum pars magna fui*—Professor Scott makes this confident prediction concerning the Higher Criticism of the New Testament: "In a few years there will not be a single scholar of standing in the world who will doubt that Matthew was written by Matthew, Mark by Mark, Luke by Luke, John by John, and that the Gospels were from the very beginning in all essentials exactly as we now have them." (p. 26). After quoting the saying of Sir William Ramsay, "I regard Luke as the greatest historian who has ever lived, save only Thucydides," Professor Scott goes even farther. "The Greek of Luke is so limpid," he says (p. 35), "so direct, and so convincing, that on this score, and this score alone, I place him ahead of Thucydides. In my judgment, Luke is the world's greatest historian." Lack of space forbids ampler quotation from this very interesting address, the perusal of which we heartily recommend to our readers.

"Homer, Grand against the Ancient Morn"

Chesterton in one of his poems has this beautiful line:

The first bird went winging south when all the world was young.

In reading it, you feel the freshness of morning, the freshness of youth. And so it is in reading Homer. Men are children here. They look about them with a simple wonder. The gleam of spears, the excitement of battle, awaken in their souls a feeling of childish glee—the glee of the child who claps his hands and cries: "Do it again!" Such is the spirit of Homer's descriptions. The shields and helmets "gleam all around"; they are the handiwork of Hephaestus or of some ancient hero; once upon a time they were stained with blood in a famous battle.

The language of children and of youthful races is poetry. The child rears his toy castles to song, improvised for every mood. One never tires of watching children at play. There is there a fresh, unconcealed play of human feeling and imagination, a pursuit of dreams and visions, a disregard for logic, yet a fundamental intuitive truthfulness, that makes the refinements of sophisticated young men and women seem sickening by comparison. There is little malice in children; there is unconscious selfishness and ever present quarrelling. So it is in the idealized children of Homer. Hurt feelings bring tears: Achilles "won't play any more"; he is inconsolable at the loss of his friend Patroclus, weeping with the tender affection and the unrestraint of a child. Homer is innocent of all sophistication, that cursed sham that stunts the human soul. This is his first charm for us.

After all, when we think it all out, life becomes very simple. The "truly simple and truly wise" see things in unity. Only the novice is bewildered. For him each thing is new, unconnected; but as time goes on, he gradually discerns in life a few great unifying principles, to which all else falls into subordination. A true picture of life is a picture of the few great concerns of man working themselves out. Homer has life in the simple. We all feel he is true to that common nature that lies just a little below our own controlled exterior. The *lacrimae rerum* he has well described. There is not a soul that is human, but will vibrate to the meeting of Hector and Andromache and the little child, "like unto a star." Here is true human nature. We have all seen the same in real life. There is, indeed, nothing more pathetic than such a parting, where the presence of the child, ignorant of the terrible danger, accentuates the pathos tremendously. The beautiful interaction of affection, the love and pride that unite in the babe, the happy, simple amusement that his dread of the plumes on his father's helmet occasions,—what in human life has a greater charm than such a picture of simple, unselfish, mutual love? What a difference it would make to put into Andromache's mouth a speech modelled on the speeches of Eve before the fall in Paradise Lost! That contrast brings out the pure naturalness of Homer.

Florissant, Mo. ROBERT J. HENLE, S. J.

Papyrus as Writing Material

(*Continued from the March issue*)

Papyrus was manufactured in various sizes and grades. The better grades were made in larger sizes, and in all grades the height exceeded the width. Pliny[1] mentions the following varieties:

Macrocollon, the largest size of all; 18 inches wide. Cicero mentions his use of it in a letter to Atticus.[2]

Charta Augusta, named in honor of the Emperor; the finest quality; in size next to the largest. About 9½ inches wide.

Charta Livia, named for the Emperor's wife, was next in quality; of the same size as the preceding.

Charta hieratica was third in quality; about 8 inches wide.

Charta amphiatrica derived its name from the principal place of its manufacture in Alexandria; 6½ inches.

Charta Saitica, named for the city of Sais. A common grade, 5¾ inches.

Charta Taeniotica; next in quality; width uncertain.

Charta emporetica was ordinary wrapping material; 4⅜ inches wide.

During the reign of Claudius, a *Charta Claudia* was added to these varieties. It was of unusual strength, being a combination of *Augusta* for the recto and *Livia* for the verso.

Papyrus was the ordinary writing material used in Egypt until about the middle of the tenth century, when it was displaced by the excellent paper of the Arabs. Among Latin writers, its use for literary purposes practically ceased in the fourth century. For ordinary documents, especially for letters, it continued in use much longer. St. Jerome[3] mentions vellum as an emergency material for letters, in case papyrus fails:

> Hoc primum queror, cur tot interiacentibus spatiis maris atque terrarum tam parvam epistulam miseritis, nisi quod ita merui, qui vobis, ut scribitis, ante non scripsi. Chartam defuisse non puto Aegypto ministrante commercia. Et si aliqui Ptolomaeus maria clausisset, tamen rex Attalus membranas e Pergamo miserat, *ut penuria chartae pellibus pensaretur.*

St. Augustine apologizes for writing a letter on vellum:[4]

> Non haec epistula sic inopiam chartae indicat, ut membranas saltem abundare testetur? Tabellas eburneas, quas habeo, avunculo tuo cum litteris misi. *Tu enim huic pelliculae facilius ignoscas,* quia differri non potuit, quod ei scripsi, et tibi non scribere etiam ineptissimum existimavi. Sed tabellas, si quae ibi nostrae sunt, propter huiusmodi necessitates mittas peto.

Cassiodorus in the sixth century indulges in an exuberant panegyric on the value of papyrus,[5] and Gregory of Tours says that papyrus was commonly used in France in the same century.[6]

During the Middle Ages papyrus was used to a certain extent by the Greeks for non-literary purposes. There is in Paris a fragment of a letter written by Emperor Michael II or Theophilus to Louis the Debonnaire between 824 and 839. In Latin usage papyrus continued as the standard writing material for registers and other documents in the church of Ravenna, specimens of which are preserved in Munich. The papal chancery continued to use papyrus for many centuries. Thirty papyrus documents, dating from 819 to 1022, are now in process of publication on facsimile plates 64x88 cmm. Of the fifteen documents in the first volume, three are from Italy, two from Germany, ten from Spain. It is of interest to note that the earliest papal bull on vellum dates from the year 967.[7]

Papyrus did not yield to vellum without a valiant struggle, traces of which remain to this day in the form of papyrus codices; but the constant use of the Bible as a work of reference in the ancient Church, combined with the durability of vellum, doomed the roll as well as the papyrus codex to extinction. Classical literature was preserved to us chiefly through the papyrus roll. Christian literature has come down almost exclusively through the vellum codex. (For the chief papyrus codices containing classical works see Kenyon, *Palaeography of the Greek Papyri,* p. 25.)

A roll is a long, continuous piece of papyrus inscribed on one side and rolled up in cylindrical form. The stationers' standard length of papyrus consisted of twenty sheets. The earliest specimens of papyrus rolls extant date from the fourth century B. C. Timotheus' *Persae,* preserved in Berlin,[8] and "The Curse of Artemisia," in the Imperial Library at Vienna,[9] are from that century. Of the third century B. C., there are extant four columns of *Antiope;* about twelve columns, besides minor fragments, of *Phaedo;* five columns of *Laches;* and portions of the *Iliad.* It is beyond doubt that the roll was used in Egypt thousands of years before the dawn of Greek and Latin literature.

A roll inscribed with writing was called βύβλος and βίβλος, the latter being really the name for papyrus, for which *liber* and *libellus* are the corresponding Latin terms. Βιβλίον was originally a diminutive, but later became a synonym for βίβλος. When rolled up, a roll was called by the Latins *volumen,* of which the corresponding Greek terms, κύλινδρος, ἐνείλημα, and ἐξείλημα, originated only at a much later date. A roll of uninscribed papyrus was termed χάρτης, in Latin *charta.* Τόμος was a roll that contained part of a larger work. A single work contained in a number of rolls was designated βιβλία, τόμοι, *libri*—always in the plural; but when several books of one large work were written on a single roll, they were called βιβλίον, *liber.* A work that was complete in a single roll was a μονόβιβλος or μονόβιβλον.[10] Subdivisions were termed λόγος, σύγγραμμα, and σύνταγμα. The word τεῦχος first meant a chest, in which several rolls were kept;[11] later, it designated a single roll; and still later, a literary work in several volumes. *Pandectes*[12] and *bibliotheca*[13] were originally applied to a work in several rolls kept together in their chest, but later to a single manuscript containing the entire Bible. *Bibliotheca* retained this meaning at least as late as the XIV Century.[14]

The length of a roll had natural limits, quite independently of the stationers' standard length. A lengthy volume was inconvenient to unroll, and references were hard to verify. The *Revenue Laws* of Ptolemy Philadelphus, which was forty-two feet long, may be con-

sidered an extreme in length; but this work consists of several documents attached to one another, and is not a literary work. The extreme of brevity is probably represented by Hyperides' *In Athenogenem*, which was only about seven feet long.[15] There were also slender and dainty rolls which added practically no bulk to the cylinder on which the papyrus was wound. Hence Martial[16] says:

> Quid prodest mihi tam macer libellus,
> nullo crassior ut sit umbilico,
> si totus tibi triduo legatur?

The natural limitations of the papyrus roll reacted on the scribe and the bookseller, who desired to produce a handy and beautiful volume. In course of time they also had their effect on the author, who divided his work into "books", one or two of which could be inscribed on a roll of convenient size.

During the classical period, only the inner side of the roll, on which the fibers ran parallel to its length, was used for writing[17]. This side is the true *recto*, which was carefully smoothed and polished, and on which the sheets were carefully flattened, so that the pen could meet with no obstruction in writing. The outer end of the roll was left blank, since it was apt to tear and become soiled in handling. Sometimes lead was used to rule the pages, but usually the fibers proved a sufficient guide to the writer. The text was written in columns (σελίδες, *paginae*)[18] with a space at the top and at the bottom left blank. A line of writing was called στίχος, *versus*. The width of the column was left to the writer's good taste; but in good literary papyri it was from two to three and one-half inches. In transcribing poetry, it was natural that a column had the width of a single verse.

If the title of a work was written on the roll, its usual place was after the last line of the text at the end of the roll. But since it was inconvenient to unroll the entire papyrus in order to ascertain the title of the work it contained, the place of the title was sometimes at the beginning, and sometimes on the outside, of the roll. But the reader's chief reliance for identifying a roll was the σίλλυβος (σίττυβος, *titulus, index*), which consisted of a little strip of papyrus or vellum, attached to the roll and projecting from it. It will be described in a subsequent article.

(To be concluded)

Columbus, Ohio DR. LEO F. MILLER

NOTES

1. *Hist. Nat.*, xiii, 12.
2. xiii, 25; xvi, 3.
3. *Ep.*, vii (CV LIV, 27).
4. *Ep.*, xv (CV XXXIV; i, 35).
5. *Variae*, xi, 38.
6. *Hist. Franc.*, ed. Mommsen in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*
7. Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* I, 89.
8. Thompson, *Introduction* etc., 47, 100, 105-107.
9. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 57. Thompson, *op. cit.*, 105.
10. Martial so designates the first book of Propertius (xiv, 189).
11. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, VII, vi, 14.
12. Cassiodorus, Bede, Alcuin. Cf. Zahn, *Gesch. des nt. Kanons.* I (Erlangen, 1888), pp. 60 ff.
13. Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 75; *ep.* V, 2.
14. Ovid, *Tristia*, I, i, 117. Cicero *Tusc. Disp.* iii, 3; *ad fam.* xvi, 17. Pliny, *Ep.*, iii, 5. See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae;* Du Cange; Forcellini, s. v.
15. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 17 f.
16. ii, 6.
17. But in Caesar's time, official despatches were written *transversa charta*, that is, the lines ran parallel with the height of the roll. Caesar adopted the book form.
18. Σελίς was originally the gangway between the rowing benches of a ship; later, the space between the columns of writings; still later, the column itself.

How St. Augustine Deprecates Criticism of Pastoral Addresses

A passage in St. Augustine's *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, ch. 9, will interest many readers of the BULLETIN.

"Noverint etiam non esse vocem ad aures Dei nisi animi affectum; ita enim non irridebunt, si aliquos antistites et ministros ecclesiae forte animadverterint vel cum barbarismis et soloecismis Deum invocare, vel eadem verba, quae pronuntiant, non intellegere, perturbateque distinguere. Non quia ista minime corrigenda sunt—ut populus ad id, quod plane intellegit, dicat 'amen'—sed tamen pie toleranda sunt ab iis, qui didicerint, *ut sono in foro, sic voto in ecclesia benedici.* Itaque forensis illa nonnunquam forte *bona dictio*, nunquam tamen *benedictio* dici potest."

Translation:

"Let them likewise know that the only voice to reach the ears of God is the heart's emotion. Thus they will refrain from ridicule, if peradventure they observe that some pastors and church ministers either lapse into barbarisms and solecisms when invoking the Almighty, or that they misunderstand and punctuate confusedly the very words they are pronouncing. Not that such mistakes should not be corrected, so that the people may say 'Amen' to what they clearly understand. Yet they must be kindly tolerated by such as have learned that, as in our law courts graceful speech is a means of elegant diction, so in church prayerful speech is an instrument of benediction. Wherefore, although forensic speech may sometimes be styled good diction, it can at no time be called benediction."

Experts in translation from Latin will realize how difficult, if not impossible, it is in the two last sentences to retain the Augustinian quip without losing the sense. There is a *double entendre* in *bene dicere* implying what the French term "bien dire" and "bénir," or, as one might say less forcibly, elegance of speech and the speech of blessing, or, the language of eloquence and the language of blessing.

Dublin, Ireland JOHN DONOVAN, S. J.

The very schoolboy who passes from his Caesar and Cicero to Xenophon and Homer is at once aware that he has emerged from the *oratio obliqua* of the oratorical period of self-complacent statesmanship, with its thumb in its double-breasted toga, into the presence of real people who do not talk like a book.—*Paul Shorey*

Socrates and Ion

A Dialogue, based on Plato's Ion

Soc. Welcome, my dear Ion! Coming from your native city Ephesus, I suppose?

Ion No, not exactly, Socrates. I am coming from Epidaurus, where I attended the festival of Asklepius.

Soc. How is that? Have the Epidaurians contests of rhapsodes at their festivities?

Ion Why, certainly.

Soc. Did you take part in any? And how did you come off?

Ion Why, man, I won the first prize!

Soc. I am glad to hear it, Ion. I hope you will meet with like success at our Panathenaea.

Ion Do not worry, old man.

Soc. I often envy the profession of rhapsodes. People in your walk of life always wear fine clothes, and to look as pretty as you can is only one number in your programme. Moreover, you are obliged to move in the company of many excellent poets, especially Homer, the best and divinest of them all. And to understand him, and not merely learn his words by rote and rattle them off as a parrot might do, is an enviable accomplishment. No man can be a rhapsode, unless he grasps the meaning of the poet whom he interprets. He cannot profess to lay bare the poet's mind before his hearers, unless he knows the poet's mind.

Ion That is certainly true and—between you and me—it has been the most troublesome part of my work. But I succeeded just the same. I honestly believe I can discourse on Homer better and with greater ease than any man living. Neither Metrodorus nor Stesimbrotus nor Glaukon nor any one else that ever lived has had as good ideas about Homer as I have.

Soc. I most heartily congratulate you, Ion, on your accomplishments, and I hope you will not refuse to acquaint me with your ideas about Homer some other time. At present all I want to ask is this: does your skill extend to Hesiod and Archilochus, or is it confined to Homer?

Ion To Homer only. Isn't that enough for you? I can roll forth beautiful things about Homer indefinitely; but as regards other poets, I neither have ideas of my own, nor can I keep awake when others hold forth about them.

Soc. You certainly surprise me, Ion. Do not other poets treat of the same themes as Homer? Is not war their one absorbing interest? Do they not speak of human society and of men, good and bad, skilled and unskilled, and of the gods conversing with one another and with mankind, and of what happens in heaven above and in the world below? Are not human life and human interests the burden of all their songs? How then do you say you can judge Homer, but cannot judge any other poet? Are not their themes the same?

Ion Well, yes, but other poets do not handle them in the same way as that prince of poets.

Soc. Ah, in a worse way, then?

Ion In a far worse way, I should say.

Soc. But surely, my friend, if you recognize the better, you can also recognize the worse. For example: in a discussion on some point of arithmetic, when several persons are speaking, some speakers are usually better than others, aren't they?

Ion I suppose so.

Soc. And he that judges which are the good speakers, can also judge which are the bad, can he not?

Ion Yes.

Soc. And in a discussion on wholesome food, when many persons are expressing their views, and one expresses better views than all the rest, will not he that recognizes the better speaker be the same as he that recognizes the worse?

Ion Yes.

Soc. And in general, in any discussion in which the subject is the same and many persons join, will not he that knows the good also know the bad speakers?

Ion Yes.

Soc. And if he cannot tell the bad, neither can he tell the good.

Ion You are right.

Soc. Is not the same critic skilful in both respects?

Ion Yes.

Soc. Now, you said a while ago that Homer and the other poets handle the same themes, but that the other poets are inferior to Homer.

Ion I did say so, and I am right, too.

Soc. Can I, then, be mistaken in saying that my clever friend Ion is a judge and interpreter of the other poets as well as of Homer? Is not the same person a judge of the bad as well as of the good? Or have we one skilled in judging good food and another in judging bad food only?

Ion No, the same person judges both good and bad. But, nevertheless, it is no use denying that I interpret Homer beautifully, but cannot interpret any other poet at all. When any one speaks of any other poet, I simply lose all interest and even go to sleep over it and have absolutely no ideas about him; but the moment Homer is mentioned, the name acts like a charm: I wake up at once and am all ears and have plenty of good things to say. I wonder what's the reason of this?

Soc. I will tell you, Ion. You said Homer's name acted like a charm. That is the explanation. You do not speak of Homer by art or from knowledge.

Ion W-h-a-t?

Soc. If you spoke of Homer by any rules of art, you could speak of all other poets, because poetry is one complete whole and is the same everywhere.

Ion Will you please explain your meaning more fully? I do love to hear you wise folk talk.

Soc. I wish I could be truly called wise. But the truth is that you rhapsodes and actors monopolize all wisdom. I am only an ordinary man who speaks

the truth. Indeed, consider what a simple and trivial thing I have just been saying, a thing any man might say: when a man has acquired knowledge of an art as a whole, the inquiry into good and bad in the domain of that art is one and the same.

Ion How do you make that out?

Soc. For example: is not painting an art?

Ion Yes.

Soc. And are there not good painters and bad?

Ion Yes.

Soc. And did you ever hear of a man skilled in pointing out the excellences and defects of Polygnotus, but incapable of appreciating other artists, and who, when the work of any other painter was produced, was at a loss what to say and had no ideas and went to sleep, but who, when he had to give his estimate of Polygnotus, woke up at once and had plenty to say? Did you ever hear of such a one?

Ion No, I did not.

Soc. Or did you ever hear of a sculptor skilled in expounding the merits of Daedalus, but who, when other artists were under discussion, had no ideas and went to sleep?

Ion No, I did not.

Soc. How is it, then, my dear Ion, that you—as you boast—have great skill in talking about Homer, but are mum about Hesiod and other poets?

Ion I am sure I do not know how that is. But it is a fact, when I lecture on Homer, my flow of words is something superb. It is the general opinion, too. But I am not so good at talking about others. Honestly, can you tell me what is the matter?

Soc. Certainly I can. You said you were charmed by Homer. That means two things. In the first place, you do not discourse on Homer from any knowledge of the subject or by any rule of art; in the second place, when you talk of Homer you are inspired, you are possessed, you are not in your right mind. Do you not know that all good poets compose their beautiful verse, not as works of art, but because they are inspired and possessed and in a sort of divine frenzy? That is what is the matter. Just as the Corybantian revellers are not in their right senses when they writhe and wriggle through their dances, so the poets, when they fall under the spell of music and metre, lose their minds and are inspired and possessed. They tell us so themselves. Listen to this:

> Like bees we wing our way
> To the gardens and dells of the Muses,
> And from their fountains of honey
> We draw our beautiful strains.

And that is what poets actually do. A poet is a light and winged and holy thing, and there is no invention in a poet's brain, until he is out of his senses. Many are the noble words which poets speak, but they do not speak by any rule of art. They move whithersoever the Muse may impel them. The god takes away the mind of the poet and uses him as his mouthpiece, just as he uses the priestess at Delphi to utter priceless things in a state of unconsciousness. Let me give you a striking instance of this: Tynnichus wrote nothing at all that any man would care to remember except that one celebrated paean which is in every one's mouth. It is one of the finest poems ever written. So here you are: the worst of poets wrote the best of songs. That is why I say, poets compose when they are not in their sober mind, but when they are charmed and possessed and in a divine *oistros.*

And as with poets, so it is with the interpreters of poets, the rhapsodes. Just as a poet is charmed by some divinity and inspired by him, so the rhapsode is in turn charmed and inspired by his favorite poet. And that is why, when you talk about Homer, you are charmed and inspired and possessed, and in fact do not know what you are talking about.

Good-bye, my dear Ion. *(Exit Socrates)*

Ion (in a rage): I wonder, is the man trying to make a fool of me? Just wait, old Socrates, I will get even with you some other time.

X.

Note

In connection with "Socrates and Ion," printed above, a few references to Plato's theory of poetic inspiration may be welcome. The subject is treated in the *Ion,* 533 D - 534 E, where poets in the act of composition are said to be ἔνθεοι ("enthused," as it were) and κατεχόμενοι ("possessed" by some divinity). In the *Phaedrus* 245 A, inspiration is styled a "kind of possession and madness" (κατοκωχή τε καὶ μανία) and its action on the poet is described by the terms ἐγείρουσα and ἐκβακχεύουσα. Further passages are *Laws* IV, 719 C and *Meno* 99 D - E. Burnet on *Apology* 22 C notes that φύσει is equivalent there to "genius," as opposed to ἔθει, "habituation," and διδαχῇ, "instruction." He renders ἐνθουσιάζοντες by "inspired," which, he says, regularly goes with the notion of "genius." Adam, commenting on the same passage, notes that φύσει implies that the poet is the mere *unconscious* vehicle of *communicated* ideas. Plato's views on the admission or exclusion of poets in the ideal State are to be found in *Republic* X, 598 B -602. III, 397 D ff., and 607 A ff. The passage in *Phaedrus* may be quoted here in full: "A third kind of *possession* and *madness* comes from the Muses. This takes hold upon a gentle and pure soul, *arouses* it and *maddens* it in song and other poetry . . . But he who without the divine *madness* comes to the doors of the Muses, confident that he will be a good poet by *art,* meets with no success, and the poetry of the *sane* man vanishes into nothingness before that of the inspired *madman.*" Plato's theory of poetic inspiration as expressed in the Ion agrees with his views expressed elsewhere, but in the *Ion* it is utilized in true Socratic fashion to prick the bubbles of the conceited rhapsode.